



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/850,069	05/08/2001	Valentino Campagnolo	Q64138	9153
3624	7590	12/29/2003		
VOLPE AND KOENIG, P.C. UNITED PLAZA, SUITE 1600 30 SOUTH 17TH STREET PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103			EXAMINER BREVARD, MAERENA W	
			ART UNIT 3727	PAPER NUMBER 17
DATE MAILED: 12/29/2003				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/850,069

Applicant(s)

CAMPAGNOLO, VALENTINO

Examiner

Maerena W. Brevard

Art Unit

3727

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 4,5 and 45-50 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 4,5 and 45-50 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 4, 5, and 45-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin in view of Davis.

Lin discloses a containment unit comprising a conformation (30) suitable for being fixed to the frame at the same anchoring point as the bottle cage support member (Figures 1 and 2) with a container (33) rigidly connected to the auxiliary supporting means (34, 35) in a rigidly cantilevered fashion beneath the bottle-cage supporting unit, but doesn't teach at least one of an electronic control system and power supply system for an electronic device being arranged and supported within the containment unit. However, Davis teaches a power supply system (20) for an electronic device (50) arranged and supported within a containment unit (26). It would have been obvious to attach the electronic device and the power supply system of Davis on the bicycle as taught by Lin, with the power supply system (20) contained in the container (33) of Lin. Doing so would provide a containment unit separable from the bottle cage, thus allowing the supply system for the device and a water bottle to be carried on the bike at the same time.

Regarding claims 5, 46, 48, and 50, the auxiliary supporting means are provided laterally with elastic clamps (10, 20) to the same degree claimed.

Art Unit: 3727

Regarding claims 45, 47, and 49, the containment device is capable of attachment to the bicycle frame independent of the attachment of the bottle-cage supporting unit to the bicycle frame by use of any additional attaching means, i.e. a binding strap.

***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments filed September 17, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The bag of Lin is a containment unit, meeting all the limitations as claimed. Although the bag functions to carry small objects, coins, etc. it is still capable of carrying and supporting small electronic devices or electronic control systems. The jacket of Davis is analogous with the bag of Lin, therefore making it obvious to carry electronic devices or control systems in the bag of Lin. As disclosed in the claim rejection above, the containment unit is fixed to the bicycle frame at the same anchoring point as the bottle cage and can be attached to the bicycle frame independently of the bottle cage by any other attaching means. the bag of Lin is rigidly connected to the auxiliary supporting means in a rigidly cantilevered fashion by means of the rigid base and beams. Furthermore, the term "rigidly cantilevered fashion" does not definitively claim the container being rigid.

4. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

Art Unit: 3727

In this case, there is motivation to carry the battery system of Davis in the container of Lin since the bag or jacket of Davis is of similar content as that of Lin.

***Conclusion***

5. This is a continuation of applicant's earlier Application No. 09/850,069. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the earlier application and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the earlier application. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action in this case. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no, however, event will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maerena W. Brevard whose telephone number is 703/305-0037. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th; 8:00 AM-6:00PM.

Art Unit: 3727

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lee W. Young can be reached on 703/308-2572. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703/872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703/305-0037.

  
Maerena Brevard  
December 15, 2003

  
GREGORY VIDOVICH  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700